

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Advisory Action mailed March 5, 2007. At the time of the Advisory Action, Claims 1-6 and 8-18 were pending in the Application. Applicant amends Claims 1 and 14 without prejudice or disclaimer. The amendments to these claims are not the result of any prior art reference and, thus, do not narrow the scope of any of the claims. Furthermore, the amendments are not related to patentability issues and only further clarify subject matter already present. All of Applicant's amendments have only been done in order to advance prosecution in this case. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

Section 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-6 and 8-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,914,953 issued to Krause et al. (hereinafter "*Krause*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

There is a multitude of reasons why the cited reference cannot inhibit the patentability of Independent Claim 1. For example, *Krause* fails to teach a routing treatment comprising switching information that determines an output port for switching packets...the routing device generating an accounting record for the first message and determining an encryption treatment for the first message, as is recited in Independent Claim 1. In regards to the Examiner's contention that Applicant's preamble is somewhat meaningless in the context of the current Office Action, Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that preambles are certainly afforded patentable weight when Applicant has elected to breathe life into this language. Thus, by the nature of Applicant's arguments, which bring the preamble under Examiner scrutiny, the preamble is a limitation to be considered. Note that this issue is now moot, as Applicant has made amendments to further enlighten the Examiner in this regard, although Applicant was not obligated to do so.

*Krause* does not show recording a first routing treatment that includes switching information that determines an output port for switching packets. Nor does *Krause* offer any disclosure of a routing device generating an accounting record for the first message and determining an encryption treatment for the first message.

The *relevant* passage cited by the Examiner (Column 31, lines 53-67) only discusses accessing specific internal portions of memory, not the limitations highlighted above. Applicant suggests the Examiner find a better reference that is more pertinent to the teachings of the pending claims.

Therefore, for at least the reasons outlined above, Independent Claim 1 is clearly allowable over the cited reference. All of the other Independent Claims include a similar limitation and, thus, are also allowable over these references for analogous reasons. In addition, their respective dependent claims are allowable using a similar rationale. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for all other reasons clear and apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge an amount of \$790.00 to satisfy the request for continued examination fee of 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e) to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P. In addition, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Thomas J. Frame at 214.953.6675.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas J. Frame  
Reg. No. 47,232

Date: March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2007

Customer Number: **05073**